

## **REMARKS**

Applicant first notes a discrepancy between the claims that the Examiner has indicated are allowed and some of those claims which were rejected by the Examiner. More particularly, the office action summary and paragraph 9 of the detailed action indicate in part that claims 19-25 and 29-38 are allowed. However, the Examiner rejected claims 25, 35 and 36 in paragraph 4 of the detailed action. Therefore, Applicant follows the detailed action of the Examiner in responding to the office action.

In light of the above comments, the Examiner has allowed claims 3, 4, 11-13, 18, 19-24, 29-34, 37 and 38. The Examiner also indicated that claims 2, 5-8, 27, 28 and 39-41 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. To that effect, Applicant has amended claims 2, 5, 8, 27, 34, 37, 39 and 41.

The Examiner rejected claims 25, 26, 35, 36 and 42-44 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Burton (GB 2,082,552). Applicant has canceled claims 25 and 26, amended each of claims 35 and 36 to depend from allowable claim 34 and amended each of claims 42-44 to depend from allowable claim 39, whereby Applicant submits that claims 35, 36 and 42-44 are allowable as depending from an allowable claim.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 9, 10 and 14-16 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Piron (US 5,431,293). Claim 1 has been canceled and each of claims 9, 10 and 14 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 2 whereby Applicant submits that claims 9, 10 and 14-16 are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. In addition, claim 15 has been amended to correct an oversight so that it is clear that the locking fingers referred to in claim 15 are the same locking fingers referred to in amended claim 2. The amendment to claim 15 does not substantively change claim 15.

The Examiner also rejected claim 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piron in view of Michael et al. (US 6,604,643). Claim 17 has

been amended to depend from allowable claim 2 whereby Applicant submits that claim 17 is allowable as depending from an allowable claim.

In light of the above amendments, Applicant submits that claims 2-24 and 27-44 are in allowable condition.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims and most earnestly solicits the issuance of a formal notice of allowability for the claims. Please call the undersigned attorney if any questions remain after this amendment.

Respectfully submitted at Canton, Ohio this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2005.

SAND & SEBOLT



By: Clay H. Cunningham  
Reg. No. 51,150

Aegis Tower  
4940 Munson Street, NW, Suite 1100  
Canton, OH 44718-3615  
Telephone: (330) 244-1174  
Facsimile: (330) 244-1173  
JAS/CHC/kab  
Attorney Docket: 1796034US1AP

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence (Amendment After Final in application serial no. 10/626,970 filed 7/25/2003) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2005.



Karina A. Butler